THE THANKS OF AN Honest Clergyman FOR Mr PAUL'S SPEECH At TYBOURN, JULY the 13th, 1716.

The Second Edition.

LONDON.
Printed for *E. Burleigh*, in *Amen-Corner*.
MDCCXVI.

Price Three Pence.

BIBLIOTHECA BODLEIANA

THE THANKS

Of an *Honest Clergyman* FOR Mr *PAUL's* SPEECH at *Tyburn*, July 13. 1716.

THE Design of Mr *Paul* to move the Passions, and to seduce the Commonalty, is so evident, that there wants only a slight Comparison of his *Letters* and his *Speech* together, to lay open his most abominable Cunning, and Deceit, and to disabuse the Honest Reader. I shall therefore first unmask the Man, and then the *Principles* he asserts the Truth of, and then leave even the most partial to judge for themselves. The

First Remark upon his *Speech* is, That He is no Member of the *Church of England* as by Law established,

and consequently Mr *Paul* himself has acquitted the Government of any Design against the *Church established*, by his Execution. Their Design must be to *strike at* the *Nonjuring Church*, of which Mr *Paul* died *a Dutiful and Faithful Member*; and not to prejudice the *Established Church*, whose *Communion* He *renounced*.

2*dly*, Mr *Paul* was *Ordained* by a *Schismatical* Bishop, presented to his Living by a *Schismatical* Bishop, and *instituted* by a *Schismatical* Bishop, in his Notion of things: *i. e.* was *Ordained* and *Presented and Instituted* to a Living, by Persons who had no Right to confer *Orders*, or to *present* or *institute*. He was therefore upon his own Principles, a *Dishoneſt*, *Knaviſh* Man, to take upon himself to Officiate in a Church, to which his Conscience told him he cou'd have no Right: And He was as *dishoneſt* to assume to himself the *Title* and *Habit* of a *Clergyman*, when he was of Opinion that the Person Ordaining him, had no more Power or Authority than a mere *Presbyter*.

3*dly*, Mr *Paul* must have taken the Oaths to the late Queen for his Living at *Orton*; and at the same time He *abjured* the *Pretender*, and swore to the *Hanover* Succession. He is *perjur'd* therefore, as well as *dishoneſt* and *knaviſh*. But more particularly still,

4*thly*, He declares that He *dies a Dutiful and Faithful Member of the Nonjuring Church, which has kept it self free from* Rebellion: And bids us *remember that King* James *the Third is our only* Rightful *Sovereign*. By which He charges All that are or have been for King *William*, Queen *Anne*, and King *George* to be *Rebels*, and asserts Those Kings and the late Queen to be *Usurpers*, and *Pretenders* to the Throne. This lets us into the plain Meaning of his Letters to the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and the Lord *Townshend*. He assures the Archbishop, *That He never did, since He was in* Newgate, *pray for the* Pretender *by Name or Title*: And he tells my Lord *Townshend*, That *He never prayed in expreſs Terms in Newgate for the* Pretender *by the name of King* James. Put this into the Language of other People, and strip off the Cloak of Words, and 'tis thus, "*I never* "*did since I was in Newgate pray for King* George *by*

"*any*

"*any Name or Title*": And, "*I never prayed in ex-*
"*preſs Terms in Newgate for King* George *by the Name*
"*of King* James." Did ever Jeſuit equivocate at ſuch egregious Rate? Could he hope to delude even Men of Common Senſe with ſuch wretched ſcandalous Arts and Doubles? King *James* it ſeems is owned in the Speech for *his Rightful Sovereign*, he ſays *'tis our Duty to ſerve Him, and we are in Conſcience obliged to do all we can to reſtore him to his Crown.* Theſe were his Principles when he went to *Preſton*, and at the Gallows. Either therefore we muſt interpret the Word *Pretender* of King *George*, to make the Man conſiſtent with Himſelf, and then what *tricking ſhuffling* Arts are Theſe? Or, if *Pretender* ſignifies the Perſon to whom every Honeſt Man has applied it theſe Eight and Twenty Years paſt, He acted againſt *Principle*, againſt his *avowed Duty*, againſt his *Conſcience*, in promiſing *to ſpend his Life in Prayers for his Majeſty*, (King *George*) *and his Illuſtrious Family.*

Again, He begs of my Lord *Townſhend* to get his Life *ſaved, that* He *might ſhew to the World how heartily* He was *ſorry for all his paſt Errors*, and promiſes that *no Man ſhould demonſtrate it more than He wou'd.* This was wrote on *Thurſday* night. On *Friday* the Speech was ſpoke, and there the very *Firſt* thing He aſks Pardon for is, *for having violated his Loyalty by taking moſt abominable Oaths againſt His Lawful Sovereign King* James *the 3d.* The ſecond thing he aſks Pardon for is, *His Scandalizing People by Pleading Guilty, i. e.* His acknowleding King *GEORGE*'s Right and Power. Compare theſe Paſſages, and they will amount to this Profeſſion: "If your Lordſhip will procure my Life, *no*
"*one ſhall demonſtrate it more* than I will, that I hate
"King *GEORGE* and all his Adherents; that I will
"endeavour by all the Methods I can to embroil His
"Affairs, ſow Sedition amongſt the People, and join
"with all that will act in Concert with me to confound
"the Nation in order to bring in King *James.*" Is This the Miſerable Wretch who ſues for Life? Is This the Man who pleads his *Gown* for his Protection? Is This the Clergyman who pretends the *Sacred Function* ſtruck

at three his Sides? Whilſt he has Hopes of Life He is contriving to *Impoſe* on, *Trick* and *Deceive* the very Perſons to whom he ſues, and from whom He expects Aſſiſtance: And at the *ſame* time muſt be *writing* this very Speech, or getting Others to *make* and *write* it for Him, which was to contain the real Sentiments of his Mind, the *Direct contrary* to what He profeſſes in his Letters.

Again. In another Letter to the Archbiſhop he ſays, *If ever I aſked or adviſed any body to riſe in* Rebellion, *I am willing to Suffer.* This on *Monday.* On *Friday* He tells the People: *You are obliged in Conſcience to reſtore King* James *the Third to the Crown: If you have any regard to your Country, bring the King*, i. e. James, *to his juſt and undoubted Right*, and declares how *glad* he ſhould be *if what* he *ſaid has any effect upon* them, *ſo as to be inſtrumental in making Them perform their Duty*, &c. To make Mr *Paul* conſiſtent with his avowed Principles, the meaning of his Letter is, "*If* "*ever I aſked or adviſed any body* to bear true Allegi- "ance to King *GEORGE, I am willing to be hang'd.*" For to bear true Allegiance to King *GEORGE*, and to be ſincere and hearty to his Intereſts, or to have been ſo to the late Queen, or to King *William*, is to *rebel* againſt the *Pretender.* If by *Rebellion* He meant the taking up Arms againſt King *GEORGE*, by his *own Confeſſion* He ought to have been hang'd as he was, for his Speech; That being one continued Exhortation to Arms. Or, is it not *adviſing to rebel* to join with Rebels? Is there no way of expreſſing one's Deſires but by *direct aſking?* Does not He *aſk to rebel* who gives his Aſſiſtance openly, and takes up Arms againſt his Lawful Sovereign? Is it not *aſking* and *adviſing*, when a Man gives it as his Opinion that 'tis *Lawful, Juſt* and *Right* to rebel? It is nothing to the purpoſe therefore whether He did or did not *Preach* up Rebellion, or *adviſe his Pariſhioners to take up Arms* by *ſeveral Seditious Sermons*, unleſs it were impoſſible for a Clergyman to *aſk or adviſe any body to riſe in Rebellion*, unleſs in the Pulpit.

Thus

Thus much I thought necessary concerning Mr *Paul* himself, not concerning my self with any Stories or Rumours about his Life or Actions; but from his own Mouth to shew him a *dishoneſt*, *knaviſh*, *tricking*, *ſhuffling*, *perjured* Rebel. And doth this Man pretend to be a *Martyr*, or hope to be with *Patriarchs*, *Prophets*, and *Apoſtles*? Then may every Parricide, every Traytor, and every Murderer hope for Heaven, and dye with the falſe Pleaſure of thinking that He hath done God good Service.

I ſhall next conſider Mr *Paul*'s *Principles*, which he has taken the Opportunity of his Dying to inculcate upon the People, in order to poiſon their Minds, and to make himſelf thought a Saint. They are Theſe. Firſt, That the *Nonjuring Church* is the only *Lawful* Church of *England*; or as in the Speech made for Mr *Hall*, 'tis the *true Catholick* Church of *England*. The 2d is, That the *Revolution* was a *Rebellion*. The 3d is, That the *Revolution* has introduced *Atheiſm* and *Hereſy*. The 4th is, That the *Pretender* has the only Lawful Right to the Crown. The 5th is, The *Security* we ſhall have of our *Religion*, *Laws and Liberties* if the *Pretender* ſucceeds to the Crown. And Laſtly, That the Church is ſtruck at by his Execution. His

Firſt Principle is, *That the Nonjuring Church is the Only Lawful Church of England*; or, as Mr *Hall*'s Speech has it, *the true Catholick Church of England*. To ſhew the Fallacy and Abſurdity of this, I obſerve,

Firſt, That the Words *Catholick Church* comprehend and always ſignify, *All Chriſtian People*; All that in all parts of the World make Profeſſion of the Chriſtian Religion. So that the Catholick Church of *England* is, All the Chriſtian People that dwell all over the Univerſe of *England*. Or if the Word muſt be confined to ſignify, *All the Chriſtian People of England*, then the meaning of, *The Nonjuring Church is the only true Catholick Church of England*, muſt be, That *all* the Chriſtians of *England* are *Nonjurors*, or the *Nonjurors* are *all* the Chriſtian People of *England*. All which is unintelligible Jargon and Nonſenſe; the Stuff which Papiſts alone can ſwallow, who pretend the Church of *Rome* to be *the* Catholick

Catholick or a Catholick Church. But perhaps it will be ſaid, that the word, *Catholick*, relates to Doctrines *univerſally* receiv'd; and then the Meaning of, *The Nonjuring Church is the true Catholick Church of England*, is, That Society of Men who refuſe to take the Oaths to KING *GEORGE*, are the *only* Society or Church of *England* who maintain a Truth *univerſally* receiv'd; which is a Contradiction in Terms. 2dly, This Aſſertion may be allowed if by *Catholick*, be meant Roman Catholick; for then 'twill be Senſe to ſay, The *Nonjuring Church* is the only true *Roman Catholick* Church of *England*. And if this be their Meaning, 'tis declaring all the *Nonjurors* to be really *Papiſts*. 3dly, The *Church of England* is, the People who join together in *Worſhip*, in *Doctrines*, and in *Diſcipline*, according to the *Liturgy*, *Articles*, *Canons* and *Laws* eſtabliſhed in *England* for thoſe Purpoſes. When therefore 'tis aſſerted that All who went into King *William*, Queen *Ann*, and KING *GEORGE* are of *the Revolution Schiſmatical Church*, and *Communion is renounced* with all ſuch, 'tis evident that the *Nonjuring Church* is reputed the *Only* Church of England. That is, The Nonjurors are the *Only*, the *All* of the People of *England*, who join together in *Worſhip*, *Doctrine*, and *Diſcipline*, according to the Liturgy, &c. eſtabliſhed. Is this their Meaning of the Word, *Catholick*? If ſo, It muſt be proved by them that Reſiſtance in all poſſible Caſes is abſolutely forbid by our Liturgy, Articles, Canons, &c. And when This is made out very clear, they muſt prove it *unlawful in itſelf*, ever to reſiſt; for our Liturgy, Canons, and Laws, *ſuppoſing* a ſettled, regular State of Affairs, Caſes of Neceſſity are *Superior* to Them, and have a *Prior* Obligation, and make that which is *contrary* to ſettled Laws, *regular* and *lawful*. When they have proved Reſiſtance unlawful in it ſelf, then they muſt prove it unlawful to join in Communion with Men of another Perſwaſion or Practice: For why can't a Man join in Prayer to God with a Man that has *reſiſted* an Evil Prince, as well as he can frequent a Church where perhaps may be *Whoremongers* and *Adulterers*, or *Thieves* or *Drunkards*? Dr *Sacheverel*, Mr *Milbourn*, and many others who hold the Unlawfulneſs

Unlawfulneſs of Reſiſtance in any Caſes, yet do not break Communion with Others on that Account, and wou'd take it very ill, not to be thought of the Church of *England*. Cannot a Man join in Communion with Another without an Approbation of his *Crimes*? What Law of our Saviour is there that forbids us to join in Common Prayer with ſuch whoſe Principles and Practices we do not approve of? When theſe things are clearly proved, which never have been yet, and I may venture to ſay, never will be, then may the Nonjurors aſſume to Themſelves to be the Only, True, *Catholick* Church of *England*. 4thly, The Nonjurors can't pray for a King, who in their Opinions had no Right to the Kingdom; Therefore They conclude that They are the *Only, True, Catholick* Church of *England*. A Concluſion juſt like This, The Papiſts cannot comply with the Settlement made at the Reformation, Therefore They are the only true Catholick Church of *England*. Which Arguments, and many more of that ſort, I ſuppoſe that what is once the Tenet of the Church can never, in no Circumſtances, ſuffer an Alteration. Their Plea for not taking the Oaths is founded upon this, That 'twas unlawful and contrary to the Doctrine of the Church to take up Arms againſt a Prince in Caſes of moſt abſolute Neceſſity. Which way will This be proved to be the Doctrine of the Church, and not rather the falſe Interpretations and Gloſſes put upon her Doctrines, by Men that miſunderſtood her Meaning? And what an everlaſting Sourſe of Schiſm is here, if Men ſhall think themſelves at Liberty to ſet up ſeparate Congregations, and to appropriate to themſelves the Title of the *Only True Church* of *England*, whenever they through Intereſt, Humour or Prejudice, ſhall miſtake the Doctrines of a Church? Were They indeed to argue thus, The Nonjurors cannot *pray for the King*, Therefore They cannot *come* to the Church eſtabliſhed, 'twou'd be much more juſtifiable than to conclude as they do, Therefore They are the *Only Church* eſtabliſhed. But even This would not juſtify their ſeparate *Meetings*, unleſs by Them a *greater Good* accrued to Chriſtianity, than the *Breach* of *Unity* is an *Evil*. 5thly, The *Revolution Church*, i. e.

All

All who adhered to King *William*, Queen *Anne*, and KING *GEORGE* were guilty of *Rebellion*; But the *Nonjuring Church has preserved it ſelf free from* that Crime? What then? Therefore the *Nonjuring* Church is the *true* Church of *England*. A ſtrange Conſequence, and as far from the Premiſes as This, You are in the Wrong, therefore I am Right. This is Black, Therefore that is White. Suppoſing the Revolution Church wrong in the Meaſures which they took, may not the Nonjuring Church be wrong in the Meaſures They took too! Whether the Revolution was a Rebellion I ſhall conſider afterwards; at the preſent we'll ſuppoſe it ſo. Doth that *unchurch* the Men concerned in it, and make Them *Schiſmaticks*. Hath the taking up Arms againſt a Prince a more peculiar Malignity, undoing the Relation to the Church, more than other Crimes? What Repugnancy or Contradiction is there between Church and Rebellion, that He which is guilty of This muſt be a *Schiſmatick* more immediately, than a Felon, or a Murderer, or any other more grievous Criminal? If there be none, then how is it an Argument that the Nonjuring Church is the *true, only*, Church of England, becauſe the *Revolution*, that is, the Preſent Eſtabliſhed Church, was guilty of *Rebellion*?

But the Revolution Church is a Schiſmatical *Church, whoſe Biſhops ſet themſelves up in Oppoſition to the Orthodox Fathers who were unlawfully and invalidly deprived by the Prince of* Orange?

To this I reply, That there is not I conceive ſuch a Neceſſary Connection or Relation of any particular Perſon to a particular Diſtrict, that if He be deprived, a Nation muſt riſe up as One Man to his reſcue, or elſe They muſt be *Schiſmaticks*. Where has Chriſt or his Apoſtles taught ſuch Tenets? If therefore a Biſhop refuſes to obey his Lawful Superiors, (ſuch was the Then King as I ſhall prove hereafter,) in a Lawful Command, and in conſequence of this He be deprived of thoſe Dignities and Titles which He received from His Prince, They are not Schiſmaticks who *deſert* him, but ſuch as *joins* with him in His Obſtinacy. But ſuppoſe Thoſe Biſhops *unjuſtly* deprived, yet Men that have God and

his

mon Prayer, visiting the Sick, or administring the Sacraments regularly. Whereas his Just Punishment was for having a hand in *Rebellion*, endeavouring to subvert our Nation, to *betray* our *Liberties*, to *give* up our Religion, to bring in a *poor-spirited*, *half-witted* Wretch to the Throne, whom they might make a Tool off as they pleas'd. 5thly. The Church *is* struck at *by this Execution*, *and He was executed for doing his* Duty. Was it his *Duty* to be drinking *Confusion and Damnation* to the KING and his Illustrious Family! Was it his *Duty to* join with Traytors? Or, to encourage *Sedition* amongst the People? Was it his *Duty* to *perjure* himself? Was it his *Duty* to be an Assistant in the Action at *Preston*, where so many *gallant* Gentlemen lost their Lives? If his Friends will vindicate his Conduct in these Points, 'twill be easy to vindicate it as the *Duty* of the Government to execute Him for it. 6thly. Then only is a Nation well governed, when impartial Justice is distributed, and neither *Clergyman* nor *Layman* escapes, if he be a *Wilful obstinate* Offender; and 'tis the Glory of a Prince and of his Ministry to keep Justice blind, and her Scales Equal. The Question ought never to be, is the Person This or That, but, is he guilty? was he willingly guilty? Is he convinc'd of the Injustice of his former Proceedings? Is he resolv'd for the future to behave himself otherwise? In such Cases Mercy is fit and proper. But if *Guilt* be accompanied with *Insolence*, with *Resolution* to continue the *same* Obstinate Offender, *Mercy* and *Pardon* are inexcusable Follies. Since therefore Mr *Paul* insisted on it, as *Loyalty* to *rebel*, and to *teach* others to do so, and thought it his *Duty* to act as He had done; since He pleaded his *Gown* for his *Protection*, and his *Sacred Function* for his *Justification*; Every honest Clergyman will think a *good Service* done to the Church, by *removing* such a Scandal from it; and will rejoice at his Execution, (however sorry they may be at his deserving it,) because 'twill be a Testimony of their hearty Disapprobation of his *Factious Rebellious Tenets*.

From what I have said, I leave every one to judge of Mr *Paul*, his *Principles* and *Practices*: As for my self, upon a fair and impartial Examination of them, I cannot

but give him my hearty and *publick* Acknowledgments for what he has said and done.

I *Thank* Him for giving us such a *Publick Warning* of the *Rashness* of the *Jacobites*, and Enemies of the Government, and for his doing it at a time when we may believe he spoke the Truth.

I Thank him for *disowning* the *Church* of *England* as by Law established; For tis clearing the *Church* of the Doctrines which He has espoused.

I thank him for speaking in that *plain* and *open* Manner he did; because it will convince every body that can but read, and that has but one Grain of Sense, that He was a *perjured* Rebel.

I Thank him for acting a Part at *Tyburn* which lets the World know, how *judiciously* the Government chooses the Persons who are to suffer, how *well* They know their Temper and Behaviour, and How *justly* They act in Executing those they pitch on.

I Thank him for going in his *Habit* to the *Gallows*; for by that He has shewn to all the World, that a Gown is not an infallible Mark of even *being a Member* of the Church of *England*; And thereby has given this publick Testimony, that those Gentlemen who approve of the late Steps against the Government either in Publick or Private, are not to be depended on or reputed as Members of our Church, tho' They wear Gowns.

I thank him for his Letters to the *Archbishop* and the Lord *Townshend*; for they have shewn him not to have Sense enough to write common English, and consequently that *Ignorance* was the Foundation of his *Zeal* and *Affection* to the *Pretender*. And Lastly,

I thank the *Government* for *executing* Him, because they have *removed* a Scandal from the Gown he used to wear, and an Offence from the Sacred Function he pretended to belong to.

July 23.
1716.

F I N I S.